



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and his estimate of the characteristic qualities of the English translations, may not have the depth and weight of Arnold's essay; his study of the details of the translation may not go beyond what H. M. Regel (in *Engl. Stud.*, Vol. 5) has already given. But his exposition of these points is clear, and save in a tendency to exalt too highly Chapman's achievement—to call attention to the mighty beauties, as Coleridge called them, and to overlook the mighty faults—his judgment is entirely sound. Furthermore, in at least two important respects he has placed the translator before us in a new light. He has called attention, in the first place, to the significance of Chapman's assertion: 'I have good authority that the books were not set together by Homer himself,' which clearly gives him priority over both Wood and Bentley in the 'Homeric question.' This authority, Dr. Lohff then shows conclusively, was the commentary of Spondanus, supplemented and corrected by the criticism of Ælian. All students should certainly be interested to see in the Elizabethan something more than the hasty, enthusiastic poet-translator that he is usually pictured. This interpretation of the poet's work is still further elaborated when Dr. Lohff shows that Chapman in his critical notes did not follow his authorities slavishly, but to a certain extent used his own critical acumen. The views of Laurentius Valla and Hesse he opposed throughout; Scaliger's preference for Virgil over Homer aroused his unconditional condemnation; and even Spondanus, his main resource, was set aside frequently, especially in the thirteenth book of the *Iliad*, to make way for some personal opinion. The directing of attention to these new aspects of Chapman's work is, as I say, the most valuable part of the monograph, and somewhat atones for its carelessness in details, and for its looseness of structure.

ELBERT N. S. THOMPSON.

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY.

The Alchemist, by Ben Jonson. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by Charles M. Hathaway, Jr., Ph. D. (*Yale Studies in English* XVII. Albert S. Cook, Editor.) New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1903. Pp. 373.

Now that the competition of bibliophiles has forced up the prices of Elizabethan and Jacobean quartos and folios to a point beyond

the purses of most scholars, such work as Dr. Hathaway has done on the text of *The Alchemist* should be warmly greeted. This new edition is a reprint of the text of the 1616 folio, collated with the folios of 1640 and 1692, and the editions of 1717, of Whalley, and of Gifford. The reprint—as far as possible an exact facsimile—must have required infinite pains, and the result seems on a somewhat careful examination remarkably accurate. Indeed the text errs, if at all, in unnecessary detail among the variants as to differences of spelling and typographical errors, for, as Dr. Hathaway points out, the folios after that of 1616 are of practically no value in establishing the text: the editions of 1692 and 1717 are but reprints of the 1640 edition, which, following the 1616 folio except in a few simple and evident corrections, regularly but not uniformly modernizes the spelling, and adds numerous typographical errors and misapprehensions of sense. The folio of 1616, then, which was issued under Jonson's supervision, collated with the quarto of 1612, and corrected in a few places by the folio of 1640, gives the correct text.

Though great care marks the preparation of the book in all its parts, it is uneven, and raises the question how far even a very satisfactory doctor's thesis—this work was originally submitted as a thesis for the degree of Ph. D.—is in proper shape for publication. Such a reprint is surely for the student, but he must find parts of it annoying. The elaborate notes—they fill 100 pages—show a knowledge of what has been written in elucidation of *The Alchemist*, but they are wordy, at times falling into talk. Surely no student of the Elizabethan drama will find much that needs glossing in the introductory matter of the play—the dedication, prologue, argument and *dramatis personae*—yet twelve of these large pages are given to notes on it. If the mere phrasing of the notes were greatly condensed, and the opinions quoted were in some cases subjected to more critical scrutiny, the gain would be great. For instance, Dr. Hathaway is not fair to himself—for he is usually a safe guide—when he quotes without qualification (p. 242) Mr. Fleay's statement that 'The Children of Queen Elizabeth's Chapel,' the 'Queen's Revels,' the 'Lady Elizabeth's,' and 'Queen Henrietta's' were but successive titles for the same company. Hardly anything in the history of the English drama is more unsettled than the changes in the theatrical companies, and such repetition of arbitrary statements

increases the confusion. Dr. Hathaway adds, of course, to the sum of our knowledge about the text, but the increase is hardly what the space given to the notes promises. On the time-honored puzzles, *heautaritis*, *tim*, *whit*, like all other editors he only guesses—with results which he honestly declares dubious.

The long introductory essay on Alchemy is also disappointing. Perhaps, for completeness as a thesis, it should go into an account of frauds of the present akin to Subtle's tricks, but certainly a student of *The Alchemist* does not need—perhaps does not care—to read of Jernegan and his gold from sea-water fraud. Dr. Hathaway writes of Alchemy under the sub-heads—'Its History,' 'The Theory of Alchemy,' 'Abuses and Knavery,' 'Its Position in England in 1610,' 'Alchemy in its Relation to Medicine, Astrology, Palmistry, and to all sorts of Swindling Operations,' 'Alchemy and Literature,' and 'Modern Gold-making Swindles.' In saying (p. 23), 'Satirist tho [Jonson] was, Jonson presented [the Alchemist's] side of the case ably, far more ably than many of the art's professors; so well, indeed, that I do not doubt it will be possible to find alchemists after his time who will maintain that he believed in alchemy, and only satirized the cheating pretenders,' Dr. Hathaway really admits that his own summary of the teachings of the alchemists does not make them clearer than does the play itself. He crowds his pages with all he can find in the literature of the time about false science and fraud, rather than presents material which in itself or by his application of it elucidates the play. Even what is given under the sections, 'Abuses and Knavery' and 'Its Position in 1610,' the most contributive sections, might be condensed, and presented with equal advantage in the notes. In a word, the material seems gathered rather for completeness in an account of Alchemy than for an introduction to the text. Here is the first reason for querying whether what was a satisfactory thesis should not have been much condensed, and given direct bearing on the text, before it was published. Another reason for the query is that the essay gives with much detail what must be well known to most persons who will use the book, Chaucer's and John Lyly's treatment of the alchemists, and, more trying still, even a recapitulation of the play itself. Thirdly, though it may relieve the tedium of the details of the introduction to hear Dr. Hathaway break through his material, many passages certainly sound too intimate in an essay introductory to a text which is and should be treated with scientific impersonality.

So well done is the text that one wishes the introduction might be cut to the scholarly discussion of the editions, the suggestive if not wholly convincing treatment of the probable date of the play, and the discussion of the sources, with a very condensed presentation of all else in it. In brief, the faults of this edition are the common defects of a thesis as contrasted with a well edited book. A little labor by Dr. Hathaway would make his edition of *The Alchemist* compact, even in quality, and as permanently valuable throughout as it now is in its text.

GEO. P. BAKER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

Det norsk-islandske Skjaldesprog omtr. 800-1300. Finnur Jónsson. København, 1901. Pp. 123. Udgivet af Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Litteratur. Bd. 28.

Professor Jónsson's work is in the nature of a survey of Eddic and Scaldic forms and is intended as a contribution to a historical Norse-Islandic "Formenlehre." As it has been the author's aim to make it fairly exhaustive, the whole field of O. Norse-Icl. poetry being included, it will readily be seen that the work is of great importance both directly as a contribution to O. N. grammar and indirectly for the textual study of manuscripts. Chronologically the survey naturally falls into two parts : 1, the period before the beginning of the written literature—800-1125 ; for which period Eddic and Scaldic lays form practically our only source ; 2, after 1125, when we have these added to by other sources, especially is this the case with the period beginning about 1250 with its large number of MSS. It is then more particularly for the first period that study of Scaldic forms is important, but also for the latter will they offer valuable supplementary material to the grammatical forms as drawn from the prose literature. The author has, however, not thought it necessary to present his material in two parts. Users of the book will perhaps sometimes find that at least a résumé of the earliest appearance and comparative frequency of forms would not have been undesirable. Nor has the author attempted to make any distinction between Norse and Icelandic lays, something that indeed was not necessary for the older period and difficult for the later.